UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	DOCUMENT ELECTRONICALLY FILED DOC #:
MARIO RINALDI,	: DATE FILED: 7/13/2021
Plaintiff, -against-	: : 16-cv-1901 (VSB) :
SCA LA GOUTTE, D'OR, et al.,	: ORDER :
Defendants.	: : X

USDC SDNY

VERNON S. BRODERICK, United States District Judge:

There is a hearing or oral argument on the parties' *Daubert* motions scheduled for July 15, 2021. The parties should be prepared to present oral argument on their *Daubert* motions. I find that a hearing with expert witness testimony is unnecessary at this time. At oral argument, the parties should be prepared to address questions related to their motions, including the following questions:

Questions for Plaintiff

- 1. Is Plaintiff seeking compensatory damages based solely on the valuation of "lost business opportunity" conducted by expert Pamela O'Neill?
 - a) O'Neill's report also calculates damages based on brand valuation. (O'Neill Rep. 19.)¹ In the joint pre-trial order, Plaintiff indicates that he seeks \$3,700,000 in compensatory damages based on industry and economic review, projections and market outlook; a Discounted Cash Flow ("DCF") analysis under the Income Approach; and a discount rate of 14.5 percent. (Doc. 114 at 10.) This aligns with

¹ "O'Neill Rep." refers the expert report of Pamela M. O'Neill, dated November 20, 2018, which was emailed to the Court as part of the parties' pre-trial submissions.

- O'Neill's "lost business opportunity" calculations. Is Plaintiff not seeking damages under the brand valuation approach?
- b) Will O'Neill's expert testimony discuss unpaid commissions?
- 2. Did Plaintiff anticipate selling Paul Goerg champagne through his potential business?
- 3. When were the projections for Plaintiff's potential business, which O'Neill relied on, (*see* O'Neill Rep. 5), prepared?
 - a) Has O'Neill spoken with anyone from Oberon Securities who prepared the projections?
 - b) Are the projections for Plaintiff's potential business based on Plaintiff selling Paul Goerg champagne?
- 4. What is the basis for Plaintiff seeking at least € 200,000 in unpaid commissions? (See Doc. 114 at 10.) How did Plaintiff calculate the € 200,000 in unpaid commissions, including the time period such commissions would have been earned?
- 5. Does a rebuttal expert need to provide independent damages calculations or models of his or her own? If so, what is your support for that proposition?
- 6. Isn't expert Mandeep Trivedi's discussion of a lack of "causal link" merely a way of explaining that O'Neill failed to consider the certain factors, such as Plaintiff's historical sale performance, in conducting her valuation? (See Trivedi Rep. 32–33.)²

Questions for Defendants

1. Isn't it fairly common practice for experts to rely on data from third parties?

2. Aren't experts permitted to rely on data, documents, and/or information that may not be admissible?

² "Trivedi Rep." refers to the expert report of Mandeep Trivedi, dated January 10, 2019, which was emailed to the Court as part of the parties' pre-trial submissions.

3. Can the concerns raised by your *Daubert* motion, including whether Plaintiff's potential business was feasible or contemplated by the contract, be dealt with through jury interrogatories? If not, why not?

SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 13, 2021

New York, New York

ernon S. Broderick

United States District Judge